(Malur Taluk).—Will the Government be pleased to state

(*a*) what is the number of major and minor tanks in Kolar District;

(*b*) what is the average rate of wet assessment per acre under major tanks and under minor tanks;

(*c*) of these tanks, how many are restored and how many unrestored;

(*d*) (1) of the lands under these tanks, what is the extent of land cultivated; (2) of land left *banjar*, and (3) what is the revenue realised from these lands;

(*e*) (i) what measures have been adopted by Government to get the unrestored tanks restored; (ii) what is the probable expenditure estimated by the Government for this purpose;

(*f*) for how many tanks have the raiyats executed *mutchalikas* agreeing to pay the contribution?

A.—The CHIEF SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT (Mr. K. V. Anantaraman).—(*a*) Major ... 552.
Minor ... 3,254.

(*b*) Under major and minor tanks, Rs. 6.

		Restored	*Unrestored*
(*c*) Major	...	477	75
Minor	...	1,092	2,162

	Acres
(*d*) (1) Cultivated ...	26,303
(2) *Banjar*	14,681
(3) Revenue realised—Rs. 1,45,549	

(*e*) (i) Triennial programme of restoration.

(ii) Not available.

(*f*) 111.

Mr. H. KRISHNAMURTHYACHAR.—It is said that there are as many as 2,162 minor tanks unrestored and 14,681 acres of *banjar* lands. In view of the difficulties which the raiyats in the Kolar District are undergoing, is it not desirable to restore these minor tanks and bring under cultivation all the *banjar* lands?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Government do want to restore them as early as possible. But all the tanks cannot be restored at once. The restoration work will have to be undertaken according to a programme previously laid down. Plans and estimates have to be prepared and funds provided. Besides, contribution by the raiyats must also be forthcoming to begin with. All that means time. Of course we are taking steps to get plans and estimates prepared for restoring all the tanks in course of time.

Mr. H. R. KRISHNAMURTHYACHAR.—How many tanks are proposed to be taken up for restoration in each year?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Please see the appendix to the budget.

Mr. H. R. KRISHNAMURTHYACHAR.—With reference to answer to (*f*), when were the *mutchalikas* executed by the raiyats and how many of the 111 tanks referred to have been proposed to be restored?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—*Mutchalikas* were executed long ago. Steps are being taken to restore all of them. But contribution must be forthcoming to begin with.

Mr. B. SRINIVASA RAO.—Are not the Government forgoing so much of land revenue owing to large extents of land lying *banjar*?

Mr. K. V. ANANTARAMAN.—Yes. But it cannot be helped till the tanks are restored.

Reduction of Establishment Charges for the Chikballapur Power and Light Station.

Q.—19. Messrs. V. VENKATASAMY CHETTY (Chikballapur Municipality) and **K. VENKATASAMY REDDY** (Sidlaghatta Taluk).—Will the Government be pleased to state

(*a*) the total load on the electric transformers at the Chikballapur Power House;

(*b*) (i) the quantity of power consumed in the town of Chikballapur and (ii) also the amount of revenue realised;

(*c*) the probable cost of establishment if only so much of power as is required for Chikballapur Town were to be supplied from the Power Station of the place;

(*d*) the cost of the present establishment for the Power and Lighting Station at Chikballapur ?

A.—The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, ELECTRICAL DEPARTMENT (Diwan Bahadur N. N. Ayyangar).—

(*a*) 235 K. V. A.

(*b*) (i) 80 K. V. A.

(ii) About Rs. 19,000 per annum.

(*c*) The establishment charges do not depend upon the present demand in the town. The existing establishment is the minimum that is required for managing a high tension station and it makes no difference if the full capacity of the station is not utilised.

(*d*) About Rs. 10,000 per annum.

Mr. V. VENKATASAMY CHETTY.— Is it not possible to reduce the cost of establishment ?

The DEWAN.—We will consider that.

EXTENSION OF THE SESSION.

At the request of several members, the **DEWAN** announced that the session would be extended on the following day (15th October 1935), the House sitting from 8 to 11 A.M.

REPRESENTATIONS—(*contd.*).

No. 50.—Reduction of licence fees for the removal of firewood from forests.

MESSRS. A. V. NANJUNDA SETTY, Arkalgud Taluk; P. BASAVE GOWDA and A. KENCHAPPA, Arsikere Taluk; H. B GUNDAPPA and B. DONDE GOWDA, Hassan Taluk; S. P. BRAHMAPPA, Hassan Municipality; MAHOMED AKBAR SHERIFF, S. C. BELURIAH and K. A. RAHIM, Minorities; B. N. CHELUVE GOWDA, M. NANJAPPA and B. L. HUTCHAPPA, Channarayapatna Taluk; B. N. BORANNA GOWDA, Belur Taluk; KARIAPPA GOWDA and K. RAMANNA, Hole-Narsipur Taluk; NARASIMHIAH, Hole-Narsipur Municipality; B. K. SOME GOWDA and B. DEVAPPA GOWDA, Manjarabad Taluk; and A. S. NANJUNDAPPA, Alur Sub-Taluk.

Mr. A. V. NANJUNDA SETTY represented that the existing rate of licence fee of 10 annas for the removal of a cart load of firewood from State and District forests was very high and prayed that it be reduced to 4 annas per cart load.

Messrs. M. S. PUTTARAMA SETTY, RANGASWAMI SETTY and **C. R. NIRVANAPPA SETTY** supported the representation. MR. M. S. PUTTARAMA SETTY suggested that the fee be abolished altogether.

Mr. B. DONDE GOWDA observed that especially in the eastern parts of the Channarayapatna Taluk very long distances had to be traversed before firewood in the forests were got at. Nearly two days would be wasted in the carts going to the forests and two days in returning, so that the cost of transit itself would be very high. A heavy fee payable in addition would only mean greater hardship to the villagers. The Government were not losing anything by permitting the firewood to be removed. In fact, whenever fire broke out in the forests, Government would necessarily have to spend a large sum of money for extinguishing it. If the forests were thinned down in such areas, occasions for such expenditure would not be many. Such being the case, he asked what the Government would lose if they accepted the representation and gave the relief asked for.

The CHIEF CONSERVATOR of FORESTS (Mr. M. Machaya) replied that the present rate of fee was being levied for a long time and that he did not think that there was any new hardship caused to the raiyats more especially since almost all of them were getting enough firewood for their own use from *hiduvali* lands.

Mr. B. DONDE GOWDA pointed out that in addition to the licence fee an illegal levy of one anna was being collected by the vendors and guards on each cart which the raiyats dared not refuse.

Mr. M. MACHAYA said that those who paid such levies were as blameworthy as those who collected them and that well-informed men ought not to encourage such practices.

Messrs. H. M. CHANNABASAPPA, M. S. PUTTARAMA SETTY and many others said that the levy had become a *mamool* practically in all districts and that in Periyapatna Taluk, for example, even a higher levy was being collected, not only in respect of firewood but also in respect of bamboo.

Mr. M. MACHAYA enquired whether the matter had been brought to the